



General Assembly

Distr.: General
13 February 2018

English only

Human Rights Council

Thirty-seventh session

26 February-23 March 2018

Agenda item 3

**Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil,
political, economic, social and cultural rights,
including the right to development**

Written statement* submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

The Secretary-General has received the following written statement, which is hereby
circulated in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31.

[2 February 2018]

* This written statement is issued, unedited, in the language(s) received from the submitting non-governmental organization(s).

GE.18-02219(E)



* 1802219 *

Please recycle



Indian administered Jammu and Kashmir – violence against women

The story about the suffering of Women of Jammu and Kashmir, Muslim women in particular at the hands of non-Muslim Rulers, has been told at the League of Nations and The United Nations. English lady Dr. Kathleen Vaughan, who was head of Kashmir State Women's Hospital, told the story for the first time to a medical member of the League of Nations in Geneva. She is the Florence Nightingale for raising her voice in the defence of women of Indian administered Kashmir.

Dr. Kathleen Vaughan's word with the medical member of League of Nations, caused a stir and Viceroy of India asked the Hindu ruler in Kashmir to act without delay. Abdul Karim a State police officer was ordered to visit chief towns of India to search for Kashmiri women in houses of ill-fame, held against their will. Many women were freed through this intervention. Tyndale Biscoe helped Abdul Karim to publish his findings in a pamphlet to create awareness.

The abuse and violence committed against Kashmiri women came to light for the first time, when an Englishman Arthur Brinkman wrote his book *Kashmir Oppressed-Wrongs of Kashmir* in 1868, and highlighted that the Dogra Ruler earned 15-25% State revenue from licensing the prostitution in Kashmir. Young Muslim girls from lower social classes like Bhangis (scavengers) and Hanjis (fishermen) were lured into fake marriages and were sold into houses of ill-fame all over British India. The State recognised the child trafficking and child girls were trafficked to places like Rawalpindi, Lahore, Peshawar, Quetta, Delhi, Mumbai and Lucknow.

Child trafficking was officially recognised by the State and the purchase of the girl child by the pimps and brothel-keepers was registered and sealed on stamped paper. The children sold for prostitution were normally fooled into believing that they would be married off. For most poor parents marriage was not an option because the Dogra administration taxed marriages as well. The tax of a marriage was usually high and beyond the reach of the poor parents. Muslims were slapped with a Khutna tax (circumcision tax) as well.

The most abhorrent part of female exploitation was that at the death of a prostitute "all the wealth gathered by the prostitutes, during their infamous life" would revert to the Hindu ruler. Brinkman writes that, "Should one of their bondwomen or dancing girl attempt to leave her degrading profession, she is driven back with the lash and the rod into her mistress's power. These facts are certain". Prostitutes were classified as Class I, Class II and Class III according to 'gratification' which included the consideration of age, income, looks and caste of the prostitute.

Later in 1920s a local barber from Gawkadal, Muhammad Subhan Hajam emerged as a social reformer. He recruited volunteers to fight against prostitution. Subhan Naayid as locals called him, would appear with a dholak (drum) and amid chanting of slogans (which he wrote himself) would urge people to refrain from going to prostitution. He got a petition signed by over 700 people, including Church Mission Society, Tyndale Biscoe, Molvi Mohammad Abdullah Vakil and other Kashmiri Muslims, Pandits, and Sikhs and presented to the district magistrate in Srinagar, seeking a ban on prostitution. His petition was accepted and prostitution was banned.

Unfortunately, the entry of Indian soldiers into the State in 1947 to date, their massive build up ever since, and utter disregard for a UN discipline on their number, behaviour and location has wronged the women, girl-child and children in Kashmir.

Rape has been used as a weapon of war against the Muslims in the State since 1990, by the Indian soldiers, 99% of whom are Hindus. These soldiers are from poor, primitive, uneducated and communal backgrounds and do not have any regard for military code of conduct. The gang rape of over 30 Kashmiri women between the ages of 14 and 87 years in Kunan-Poshpora on the intervening night of February 23 and 24 in 1991, duly reported to UN Human Rights Commission and Sub Commission and Human Rights Council, continues to echo in the court rooms of Kashmir. Many

victims have died carrying the shame of rape with them and the surviving ones are jostled from pillar to post by the justice system.

Supreme Court of India on 9 March 2015 stayed the proceedings against the Indian security forces including the directions given by the J&K High Court to pay 'compensation' to the survivors. Besides monitoring the payment of 'compensation' to the victims, the division bench of the High Court was monitoring the investigation ordered by a judicial magistrate. Indian courts are failing the women of Kashmir in their fight to redeem their honour.

Indian security forces and army have created circumstances that overwhelm the endurance of women and these forces operate above law. The death of around 100,000 males since 1990 and the daily loss of life has created a gender deficit. There are thousands of widows and thousands of Kashmiri young girls, who may not find a male partner. These households have been left without an earning male in the family. For the first time in 144 years in the history of Kashmir from 1846-1990, a non-Kashmiri and a non-State person has been able to wade into the privacy of the home and assault women. Women are beaten in their homes, on the streets and outside their homes on a daily basis, to make an example out of them.

Men are languishing in prisons, youth have involuntarily disappeared and the profiled youth have gone into hiding. The females are left to fend for the family and despair for the days ahead. Indian administered Jammu and Kashmir has surfaced as the poorest State in India. Patten and Chinari sex rackets of 1980s and the VIP sex scandal that surfaced in 2006 are indicators that Kashmiri women have fallen on hard times and the administration has a plan to humble and destroy the community fabric in Kashmir Valley.

The plight of the Kashmiri women and the future of the girl child in the Indian administered part of Kashmir is abysmal for any description. One example here might assist the Human Rights Council, NGOs, Intergovernmental organizations and other institutions, to understand, the life to which a Kashmiri Muslim woman is driven by the circumstances created by the presence of Indian soldiers.

Zeba Begum a widow and mother of two unmarried daughters works eight hours at the Government Middle School in Adipora, Kunzar, Baramulla as cleaner, peon and chowkidar (watchwoman) on a salary of Rs. 50 (Fifty Rupees) a month since 1985. Apart from performing these jobs, she also cooks midday meals for children. Gender abuse in Kashmir is a policy to starve, humble, disgrace and coerce families into submission. Teachers and students of a school, are witness to this abuse of a widowed female for the last 32 years.

Kashmiri women and girl-child are insecure in their own home and in their own State. They are land locked and cannot have a life or future outside Kashmir. The Kashmiri males travelling to various States of India for work or for study remain a suspect twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. They are denied accommodation in hotels and the local communities refuse to accept them as tenants. Many students and workers from Kashmir have been murdered by Hindu fanatics.

Another example of harassment and violence against women is the treatment meted out to the wife of Kashmiri leader Shabir Ahmad Shah by the Enforcement Directorate of National Investigation Agency of India. On 30 January 2018 The Enforcement Directorate of National Investigation Agency of India summoned, once again Dr Bilques Shah wife of Shabir Shah and was questioned for seven hours. Enforcement Directorate asked her the same questions which she had answered many times earlier, about her job, livelihood, education of children, bank details, earnings, property, etc.

Dr. Bilques Shah objected to questions, whose answers she had already given in writing many times before. She was advised by the Assistant Director Enforcement Directorate that the previous Enforcement Officer had been transferred out to his parent department and he was totally fresh to the case, so needed to have all the details once again. Shah's nephew was also questioned for 10-12 hours from morning 11am to evening 10pm. on 29 January 2018, to harass the family.

Shabir Shah heads Democratic Freedom Party and is part of Joint Resistance Movement in Kashmir. He is 62 years old and has spent most of his life in prison or under house arrest. In 1992 Amnesty International adopted him as a Prisoner

of Conscience. He is being held in Tihar jail since July 2017 and was denied bail on 22 August 2017 and 31 January 2018. Dr. Bilques Shah has to travel from Srinagar to Delhi to assist her husband and to answer the Enforcement Directorate. Treating a Doctor, a mother and a wife in this manner and playing 'wolf' and the 'lamb' with her is a shame. Families of other Kashmiri leaders arrested by Enforcement Directorate and held in Tihar jail, face the same abuse and harassment.



General Assembly

Distr.: General
13 February 2018

English only

Human Rights Council

Thirty-seventh session

26 February-23 March 2018

Agenda item 4

Human rights situations that require the Council's attention

Written statement* submitted by the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

The Secretary-General has received the following written statement, which is hereby circulated in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31.

[2 February 2018]

* This written statement is issued, unedited, in the language(s) received from the submitting non-governmental organization(s).

GE.18-02222(E)



★ 1 8 0 2 2 2 2 ★

Please recycle



Indian administered Jammu and Kashmir – status of Indian army

JKCHR wishes the 37th session of Human Rights Council, every success and sincerely hopes that under the guidance of its President Mr. Vojislav Šuc it would help the 'people whose rights have been taken away,' regain their rights.

One such situation known to the United Nations for the last 70 years is the State of Jammu and Kashmir and its people, who ought to have gone through a UN supervised vote between April 1948 and October 1948, to determine their future. UN Security Council at its 606th meeting on 6 November 1952 has reiterated that "The ultimate objective of a fair and impartial plebiscite under the auspices of the United Nations has, after all, been written into solemn agreements by the two Governments and endorsed by this Security Council. These agreements have been affirmed and reaffirmed by the two governments many times during the last three and a half years. The transformation of this agreement into the reality of the actual voting ought not to present insuperable difficulties."

Although there is a UN brokered cease fire since January 1949 between India and Pakistan, Indian security forces have continued their instinct of indiscriminate killing in Kashmir. The stay of Indian security forces in Kashmir outside the terms of its agreement with the Kashmir government and the discipline imposed on its number, behaviour and location, by the UN Security Council makes it an instrument of occupation and oppression.

The situation has deteriorated to such disturbing levels that even Indian supported administration has raised a red flag. On 23 January 2018 chief minister of the Indian administered part of Kashmir made a written statement in the legislative assembly (elected from only a part of the territory) that in the last two years the government had imposed curfew, 186 times in the Valley.

Since 10 January 1990 and more so since June 1993 UN World Conference on Human Rights JKCHR has been reporting to the Human Rights Council (former Commission and Sub Commission) and other UN bodies that Kashmiri youth are a target population for Indian security forces. They have killed a generation in the last 27 years. It is encouraging to see Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Egypt, Germany, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America as members of the current session. These countries in particular have served on the UN Security Council and have finalised a mechanism for a free, secure and impartial plebiscite in Kashmir.

Human Rights Council has been listening to various views on Kashmir. It is time to revisit the Kashmir case as explained by Netherlands at the 566th meeting of UN Security Council held on 10 November 1951. Netherlands representative in the Security Council Mr. Von Balluseck stated, "The lack of agreement therefore, does not concern this right of self-determination. It concerns the ways and means and procedures to establish the conditions for a fair expression of the will of the people of the State of Jammu and Kashmir who want to make their choice free from any kind of fear or intimidation."

The above named 11 countries currently sitting on the Human Rights Council, know that India on 15 January 1948 at the 227th meeting of UN Security Council has surrendered itself for a UN supervised plebiscite. It testified that, "We desire only to see peace restored in Kashmir and to ensure that the people of Kashmir are left free to decide in an orderly and peaceful manner the future of their State. We have no further interest, and we have agreed that a plebiscite in Kashmir might take place under international auspices after peace and order have been established. Everything that we have done has been in discharge of our legal, constitutional, and moral responsibilities and obligations."

Human Rights Council has to check 'if governments do what they agreed on at the United Nations'. Indian army was called in relation to a 'grave situation' alleged by Pandit Nehru in his telegram addressed to Prime Minister of Pakistan and later the United Nations. A cease-fire brokered by UN between various elements, including India and Pakistan on 01 January 1949 has reversed the 'grave situation' allegation.

Today we do not have the Jammu and Kashmir that India wanted to defend on 27 October 1947. Jammu and Kashmir was entrusted to arrange a plebiscite in collaboration and under the supervision of UN. It was required to set up a provisional government under the supervision of United Nations, which had to be fully representative, including a representation from Azad Kashmir and Gilgit and Baltistan. The consent of Government of Pakistan as a party to the dispute was an essential.

Human Rights Council has to check upon the UN Security Council debate held at its 284th meeting on 17 April 1948. It was flagged that "the Kashmir dispute is the greatest and gravest single issue in international affairs". The Council should check upon the three Indian pledges - first pledge made to the people of the State on 27th October 1947, second pledge made to the Government of Pakistan on 31 October 1947 and the third pledge made to the international community at the UN on 15 January 1948. India has surrendered the merits of its accession to a UN supervised vote of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

The dispute on the question of demilitarization, in particular, on the character and number of armed forces on either side of cease fire line, has stalled the implementation of UN Resolutions on Kashmir. The Council has a role to step in and encourage an equitable demilitarization. Council may need to encourage a reference to ICJ. United Kingdom had suggested on 22 November 1947 that a reference be made to ICJ. Pakistan was only 3 months old and for obvious reasons could not manage the proposed reference.

3 years and 9 months later on 27 August 1951, Office of South Asian Affairs and Office of United Nations Political and Security Affairs of United States prepared a document on Kashmir titled, "Kashmir Dispute: Future Action". The document stated, "At some time in the course of our efforts, we might consider asking the Security Council to request the International Court of Justice to render an advisory opinion regarding the legality of the act of the Maharaja of Kashmir in signing an instrument of accession to India. If the ICJ finds the accession was invalid, this would knock out one of the principal Indian arguments supporting their occupation of Kashmir." US had taken United Kingdom's Foreign Office on board but the decision of going to ICJ was put on hold.

United States of America currently on the Human Rights Council carries a higher burden of responsibility, in regard to present Indian military oppression in Kashmir. US has to follow upon its proposal for demilitarization made at the 571th meeting of the Security Council. US managed an overwhelming influence in Kashmir dispute. Dr. P. F. Graham appointed as UN Representative for India and Pakistan and Admiral Chester Nimitz appointed as Plebiscite Administrator in Kashmir were both US citizens. US citizens were also in the UNCIP.

Human Rights Council, in particular Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Egypt, Germany, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America as members of the current session, that have remained authors of a UN supervised vote in Kashmir, need to recommend a reference to ICJ on the following and query the status of Indian army:

1. Sheikh Abdullah gave an assurance at the UN Security Council on 5 February 1948, that "the Indian forces were there on a provisional basis and need not be feared because they would be supervised by the Commission of the UN Security Council."
2. The 'grave situation' pleaded by India on 27 October 1947 has been reversed by a UN brokered cease fire on 01 January 1949.
3. India has surrendered its accession at the UN on 15 January 1948 for a UN supervised vote.

Therefore, the status of Indian army does not remain the same as claimed on 27 October 1947. Indian army has over stayed its mandate and has violated the 4 stipulation placed in the bilateral agreement and 3 restraints placed on it by UN. The assurance of a supervision by the Commission has been missing. Indian army needs to be withdrawn. A component of UN forces needs to be added to UNMOGIP to maintain the character and dignity of the cease fire line, until UN resolutions are implemented. Council needs to help the people, whose rights have been taken away.

UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld visited Srinagar on Friday 20 March 1959. He was there from 20-22 March 1959 to assess the Kashmir situation. Human Rights Council could recommend another visit by the UN secretary general as highly desirable. Council could invite the UNMOGIP for a private discussion and a public debate on the massive wrong done by the Indian army to the people and habitat of Kashmir. In the interim there is a need to appoint a Special rapporteur on Kashmir.



General Assembly

Distr.: General
13 February 2018

English only

Human Rights Council

Thirty-seventh session

26 February-23 March 2018

Agenda item 7

**Human rights situation in Palestine and other
occupied Arab territories**

Joint written statement* submitted by Al-Haq, Law in the Service of Man, the BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights and the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, non-governmental organizations in special consultative status

The Secretary-General has received the following written statement, which is hereby
circulated in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31.

[2 February 2018]

* This written statement is issued, unedited, in the language(s) received from the submitting non-governmental organization(s).

GE.18-02223(E)



* 1 8 0 2 2 2 3 *

Please recycle A small recycling symbol consisting of three chasing arrows forming a triangle.



Legalising the Illegal: The Status of Jerusalem and Unlawful Forcible Transfer*

Since 1948, Israel's colonisation, displacement, dispossession, and demographic alteration in Jerusalem have violated international law governing the status of Jerusalem. Following the United States of America's unilateral recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital, Israel has furthered its unlawful settlement enterprise in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT). In January 2018, Israel's Parliament adopted a second amendment to the Basic Law on Jerusalem. The original adoption of the Basic Law in 1980, providing for the *de jure* annexation of occupied East Jerusalem, was internationally condemned by the United Nations Security Council.¹ Since then, the Knesset has advanced a number of bills aimed at further altering Jerusalem's borders, annexing settlements, and revoking Palestinians' residencies.

1. Status of Jerusalem

Since 1967, Israel has pursued its demographic vision of a 'Greater Jerusalem' aimed at expanding the city's municipal borders to annex illegal settlements, while ensuring an overwhelming Israeli Jewish majority in the city.² Currently, approximately 65 percent of settlers reside in what Israel calls the 'Greater Jerusalem' area,³ while in East Jerusalem, settlers constitute some 43 percent of the population.⁴ Meanwhile, Israel's discriminatory planning and zoning regime has caused an acute housing shortage for Palestinians in East Jerusalem. Israel's Jerusalem Municipality only grants 7 percent of building permit requests to Palestinian residents, despite them making up some 40 percent of Jerusalem's total population. Forced to build without a permit, around 100,000 Palestinians are at risk of 'administrative' demolitions in East Jerusalem.⁵ Israel further appropriated 35 percent of the land for settlement construction in East Jerusalem, while Palestinians are only allowed to build on 13 percent.

Since 2017, Israel has implemented unilateral measures to redraw the municipal borders of Jerusalem, adopting legislation to remove Palestinian neighbourhoods behind the Annexation Wall from the city, while annexing settlements in the Jerusalem periphery. On 2 January 2018, the Knesset adopted Amendment No. 2 to the Basic Law on Jerusalem, which requires an 80-member majority vote in order to transfer "authority related to the area of Jerusalem [...] to a foreign body, whether political or governmental,"⁶ thus pre-empting negotiations with the Palestinian Authority on Jerusalem and denying Palestinians the right to self-determination in their capital. At least six other bills, currently under consideration by the Parliament, aim at illegally altering the borders and demographic composition of Jerusalem.⁷ For instance, the bill for the 2017 Jerusalem and Its Daughters Law will extend Jerusalem's jurisdiction to the 'local authorities' of Beitár Illit, Ma'ale Adumim, Giv'at Ze'ev, Gush 'Etsion, and Efrat settlements, while creating 'daughter municipalities' for the Palestinian neighbourhoods of Kufr 'Aqab, Shu'fat Refugee Camp, and 'Anata, located behind

¹ Security Council Resolution 478 (1980).

² Israel's demographic target for 2020, as set in 2009, is 60 percent Israeli Jews to 40 percent Palestinians in Jerusalem.

³ Israel's Central Bureau of Statistics recorded 175,900 settlers living in 'Israeli localities in Judea and Samaria' in Jerusalem's 'metropolitan area' in 2016, http://www.cbs.gov.il/reader/shnaton/templ_shnaton_e.html?num_tab=st02_25&CYear=2017. See also B'Tselem on the number of settlers in the OPT: B'Tselem, 'Statistics on Settlements and Settler Population', updated 11 May 2017, <https://www.btselem.org/settlements/statistics>.

⁴ According to the Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistic, 264,937 Palestinians lived in East Jerusalem in 2016.

⁵ OCHA, 'High numbers of Demolitions: the ongoing threats of demolition for Palestinian residents of East Jerusalem', 2017, <https://www.ochaopt.org/content/high-numbers-demolitions-ongoing-threats-demolition-palestinian-residents-east-jerusalem>.

⁶ Basic Law Bill: Jerusalem, Capital of Israel (Amendment No. 2), P/20/4346 (unofficial translation).

⁷ Proposed Basic Law: Jerusalem, Capital of Israel (Amendment – Referendum), P/20/4524; Proposed Basic Law: Jerusalem Capital of Israel (Amendment – West Jerusalem), P/20/1752; Proposed Law for the Rescue of Jerusalem as a Jewish and Democratic Capital City – 2017 [5771], P/20/4546; Bill for the Jerusalem and Its Daughters Law, P/20/4386; Bill for the Jerusalem and Its Daughters Law – 2017 [5778], P/20/4109; and Proposed Greater Jerusalem Law, P/20/4158.

the Annexation Wall, and threatening the removal of at least 140,000 Palestinians from Jerusalem.⁸ These bills patently violate Israel's obligations, as Occupying Power, to refrain from altering the character of the OPT, including East Jerusalem, and further violate the right of Palestinians in Jerusalem to choose their own residence, to movement, to family life, to health, to education, and to a range of entitlements and facilities necessary for the fulfilment of their fundamental rights.

2. Status of Palestinian Residents of Jerusalem

Since 1967, Israel has revoked the residency status of more than 14,500 Palestinians from Jerusalem.⁹ Israel conferred 'permanent residency' status on Palestinians in Jerusalem, which can be arbitrarily revoked by Israel's Ministry of Interior (MoI) on a number of grounds, including for living 'outside of Israel' (such as in the West Bank, excluding East Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip) and not being able to prove 'centre of life' in Jerusalem.

On 13 November 2017, several Members of Knesset introduced a bill to grant the MoI discretion to revoke the residency status of "residents of East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights" on the ground of 'breach of loyalty' to the State of Israel.¹⁰ In June 2006, Israel revoked the residency of the former Palestinian Minister of Jerusalem and of three Palestinian parliamentarians on 'breach of allegiance' grounds. The four petitioned Israel's Supreme Court challenging the authority of the MoI to revoke permanent residency status on this basis.¹¹ In 2013, while the case was pending, the four threatened Palestinians were forcibly transferred out of Jerusalem, while the MoI revoked the residency status of nine other Palestinians, currently serving long-term prison sentences, on the same ground. In September 2017, some 11 years later, Israel's Supreme Court ruled that the MoI has no legal authority to revoke residency status based on 'breach of allegiance', acknowledging the illegality of the measure.¹²

Israel further denies family unification and child registration as a tool of Palestinian displacement and demographic control. In June 2017, Israel's Parliament renewed for the fourteenth consecutive time the Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law (Temporary Order) of 2003, practically freezing all family unification applications. Prior to the 2003 'Temporary Order', the spouse of a Palestinian Jerusalem resident would receive permanent residency status following a lengthy and discriminatory family unification process. Since 2003, spouses of Palestinians in Jerusalem only receive 'temporary permits', subject to annual renewal. Israel imposes stringent age criteria on unification; only women 25 years or older, or men 35 years or older, can apply. Between 1995 and 2013, Israel refused 43 percent of family unification applications, including 20 percent for 'security reasons'. Individuals may further have their unification permits punitively cancelled if Israel considers their extended family members an 'indirect security threat'.

Between 2016 and 2017, Israel introduced bills to legalise punitive residency revocation. The Interior Minister may "cancel the visa or permanent residency permit of the relative of a person who performs a terrorist act or contributes to it, whether through an act or by knowledge, before, during, or after the undertaking of that act".¹³ Recently, the MoI punitively revoked the residency status of family members of alleged Palestinian attackers. Following Fadi Qunbar's alleged attack in January 2017, Fadi's niece Sawzan Allan received a letter informing her that the MoI was revoking her husband's residency permit, although he had lived in Jerusalem on family unification permits since 2007. The MoI also

⁸ Jaclynn Ashly, 'Palestinians in Kufr Aqab: "We live here just to wait"', Al-Jazeera, 7 January 2018, <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2018/01/palestinians-kufr-aqab-live-wait-180107073623251.html>.

⁹ B'Tselem, 'Statistics on Revocation of Residency in East Jerusalem', updated 27 May 2015, https://www.btselem.org/jerusalem/revocation_statistics.

¹⁰ Bill for the Entry into Israel Law (Amendment – Applicability to East Jerusalem's residents and resorting to the Interior Minister's judgment), 2017, P/20/4744.

¹¹ HCI 7803/06, Abu Arafah et al.

¹² Article 45, Hague Regulations.

¹³ Proposed Entry into Israel Law (Amendment – Cancellation of Visa and Permanent Residence Permit for Terrorists and Their Families due to Participation in Terrorist Activity) – 2017 [5767], P/20/3994 (unofficial translation).

punitively revoked the residency permits of nine Qunbar family members, and the permanent residency status of Fadi's mother. These measures clearly amount to collective punishment, in violation of international law.¹⁴

Conclusion and Recommendations

Since 1948, Israel has altered the character, status, and demographic composition of Jerusalem, forcibly transferring Palestinians from the city. By legislating for the removal of Palestinian neighbourhoods behind the Annexation Wall, and the revocation of Palestinians' residency status, Israel continues to gradually eliminate Palestinian presence in Jerusalem. Accordingly, we call on Israel, as Occupying Power, to:

1. End its occupation of the OPT, including East Jerusalem;
2. Suspend and repeal all legislation and bills seeking to alter the status of Jerusalem;
3. End practices leading to forcible transfer in the OPT;
4. Dismantle all settlements in the OPT, including in and around East Jerusalem, and cease further settlement construction and expansion;
5. Dismantle the Annexation Wall and its associated regime, and ensure territorial contiguity within the OPT.

We further call on third States, including Member States of the Human Rights Council:

6. Not to recognise as lawful any changes to the character, status, and composition of Jerusalem;
7. To end impunity for international crimes, including forcible transfer, committed in the OPT;
8. To cooperate to bring to an end Israel's occupation and to impose sanctions against the State of Israel.

*Community Action Centre (Al-Quds University) and The Society of St. Yves – Catholic Center for Human Rights, NGOs without consultative status, also share the views expressed in this statement.

¹⁴ Article 33, Fourth Geneva Convention.